

M_r is $\text{CH}_2=\text{C}(\text{CH}_3)\text{C}(\text{O})\text{OCH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{Si}(\text{OCH}_3)_3$,

r is 4, and

G is $-\text{SCH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{Si}(\text{OCH}_3)_3$.

Remarks

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction requirement is requested.

Applicant notes with appreciation that the Examiner sought to discuss the restriction requirement with the undersigned on August 4, 2003, and regrets that the undersigned was unavailable to take the call and that no message was received.

Applicants acknowledge that claims 1-22 cover multiple species of the invention but respectfully submit that the scope of the claims is reasonable and that the claims may be examined together under 37 C.F.R. § 1.141.

Applicant submits that the different species covered by the claims are so interrelated that a search of one species will reveal art to the others. Were restriction to be effected between the various species covered in claims 1-22, separate examination of the various species in the claims would require substantial duplication of work on the part of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. Even though some additional consideration would be necessary, the scope of analysis of novelty and unobviousness of all the species covered in claims 1-22 would have to be as rigorous as when only some of the claimed species were being considered by themselves. Clearly, this duplication of effort would not be warranted where these claims of different categories are so interrelated. Further, Applicants submit that if restriction were to be effected between the different species claimed in claims 1-22 it would place an undue burden by requiring payment of a separate filing fee for examination of the nonelected claims, as well as the added costs associated with prosecuting multiple applications and maintaining multiple patents. Such an outcome would also place an undue burden on the public by establishing a multiplicity of patents in an area that can be concisely and appropriately covered in one patent.

Conclusion

Continued prosecution of this application is respectfully requested.

This paper is believed to be fully responsive to the restriction requirement. In the event that it is deemed otherwise, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the indicated

telephone number to discuss the restriction or any other questions that might be readily resolved with a teleconference.

It is believed that no fee is due; however, in the event a fee is required, please charge the fee to Deposit Account No. 13-3723.

Respectfully submitted,

September 19, 2003
Date

By: Robert H. Jordan
Robert H. Jordan, Reg. No.: 31,973
Telephone No.: (651) 733-6866

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833